DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 080 000 FL 003 737

AUTHOR Greenman, Joseph G.
TITLE The Language Situation in Israel as Related to Sociolinguistics.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 63p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Arabic; Attitudes; Diachronic Linguistics; Diglossia; *Hebrew; Language Development; Language Planning; *Language Research; *Language Role; Language Usage; Literature Reviews; *Multilingualism; Official Languages; Pronunciation; Second Languages; Semitic Languages; *Sociolinguistics; Standard Spoken Usage; Synchronic Linguistics; Yiddish

ABSTRACT

This paper provides a sociolinguistic discussion of the language situation in Israel, based on relevant linguistic and Hebraic literature and on the author's two year visit to the area. The author discusses the background and use of the many different languages spoken in the country; the function of each language is described. Characteristics of Hebrew as it is spoken in Israel are noted; four main varieties are mentioned. One portion of the paper reports on current research and suggests areas for future sociolinguistic study. An appendix provides examples of the multilingual situations that arise in specific Israeli homes, characteristics of mulitlingual situations throughout the Israeli population. (VM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 080000

THE LANGUAGE SITUATION IN ISRAEL

AS RELATED TO

SOCIOLINGUISTICS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Joseph G. Greenman
1972
Dept. of Linguistics
308 Hayes Hall
SUNY/Buffalo
14214.

FL 003 737

0. INTRODUCTION

This work constitutes a preliminary investigation of the language situation in Israel as analysed through the linguistic and Hebraist literature on the subject. Observations made during the author's two year visit to the area have also been introduced.

Since its founding in 1948, the State of Israel has come under various types of scrutiny by social scientists. This is the result of her unique character which, in turn, is the result of the unusual circumstances surrounding her very existence.

Israel was given formal status among the commonwealth of nations by United Nations vote. As a homeland for the Jews, she had the unenviable task of providing a home for people who were trying to reconstruct their lives after the horror of World War II, as well as for thousands of Jews who were inhabitants of neighboring Arab countries at the time.

The foundation for the State of Israel had been principally laid by Zionist pioneers who came to what was then Palestine. They represented many countries, but most came from Eastern Europe during the period immediately following World War I. For twenty-five years this hard-core of zealots battled the British to achieve indenpendence for the land they believed to be rightfully theirs, as a fulfillment of the promise made by God to Abraham, as described in the Old Testament.

Unfortunately for all concerned, there were autochtho-

nous people of Arab descent who repudiated the Jews' claim to the land. This question of the "rightful ownership" of this strip of land that borders the eastern end of the Mediterranean has become the basis of the political question which now encompasses the entire Middle East. It is this political crisis, and the uncertainty of its outcome, which complicates the task of one who would analyse what is now the State of Israel. The fact that Israel now has authority over almost a million Arabs who have become a "people without a country" makes even the compilation of a census a touchy issue.

For the above reasons the object of the research of this paper will be carefully delimited. I do not wish to be drawn into the political problems of the Middle East and therefore, will restrict the discussion to an investigation of the linguistic situation in Israel.

0.1. Since Israel was founded as a haven for a people whose members were citizens of virtually every country in the world, their peaceful coexistence depended, to a great measure on the government's ability to introduce some sort of homogeneity in the society.

Perhaps the greatest force for unification was the introduction of Hebrew as the national language. Hebrew had been the one feature which all Jewish communities had come in contact with, as it is the traditional vehicle for the Jewish body of laws, the Torah. Regardless of what modifications the

individual communities had made of the interpretation of the law, it was always transmitted in Hebrew.

Since Hebrew had not been spoken for over 1,500 years, it had to be revived and changed in various ways for it to serve as a medium for the concepts and artifacts of a modern society. The revival of a dead language is a phenomenon that is unique in the world's linguistic history, and this too complicates the examination of the language situation in Israel. For this reason I have chosen a relatively new, flexible area of investigation, Sociolinguistics, as the framework by which to investigate the highly complex, but extremely interesting language problem which will serve as the subject of this paper.

0.2. To describe in a cogent way the melange of languages and dialects which are found in Israel, according to Blanc, "...would in all likelihood, defy the imagination of the most resourceful dialectologist."[1] In view of this, and the analytical complexities which result, I shall arrange the discussion in the following way:

A. A brief look at the Israeli language situation. For the purpose of this discussion a static view will be taken; i.e., the statements and assumptions made may be taken as valid for the present, but are obviously subject to change over time. Included in this section will be an "Israeli Sociolinguistic Profile Formula", and a discussion of the perpetuation of the minority languages which this formula indicates are currently in use;

B. A discussion of Hebrew, including historical information as well as the language as it is found in Israel today. This section will be offered as a review of literature specifically dealing with the topic of Hebrew.

C. Finally the paper will close with a section on suggestions for future study using as a framework an outline abstracted from a paper by Mathiot.[2]

I believe that Israel is a "sociolinguist's dream" in terms of the complexity of the problems found there and the relative facility with which they may be examined. Using the items cited in the points mentioned above, I shall suggest areas for study in Israel which have been discussed in relation to other language situations.

Some of the inferences made on the basis of statistical data may be considered dated by readers who are very familiar with the Israeli language situation. The bulk of this statistical information was taken from the 1961 Census,[3] and it is true that several factors have changed the trends that were indicated then.[4]

In spite of these changes, constant work on the part of the Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics has made significant contributions to the updating of certain figures. Though much shallower in scope and implication, the annual Israeli Statistical Abstract provides a supplement to the magnum opus of 1961.

1. An ordered, cogent description of the language situation

in Israel is no mean task. As indicated above, statistical inferences are subject to question, and in some cases the data is completely unavailable. In addition, the very question of "order" introduces many methodological difficulties. What statistics are significant, how to organize the available data, how deeply to examine each of the many complex areas, and even what areas are the most valuable to scrutinize are the immediate ones that come to mind.

1.1. One valuable methodological tool that has come out of the Sociolinguistic investigation is the "National linguistic profile formula" developed by Ferguson as a refinement of the work of Kloss and Stewart.[5]

In this system of analysis, a political unit is chosen and analyzed taxonomically as to the languages in use and a broad description of their functions in the country. Ferguson briefly summarized the method by saying it:

> "consists of (1) identifying the number of major and minor languages and languages of special status in the nation and (2) Representing them in an additive formula using capital and lower case letters standing for language types and functions respectively. A third, more informative expansion of the formula specifies the languages by name, so that a seperate key can provide information on degree of linguistic distance among them and dialect diversity within them;[6] if necessary, information can be added on the diversity of writing systems used."[7]

The policy of instituting Hebrew as the Israeli national language has been remarkably successful, considering the obstacles that had to be overcome. According to the 1961 census al-

most 80% of the total population used Hebrew as an "everyday" language. (Report on Language, Literacy, and Education, Census Report, Vol. 15, p. XXXIV.) Nevertheless, the census also lists some twenty-five languages as called the "main language"[8] of about 39% of the same population. Acknowledging the inaccuries that may result because of the population trend changes mention above, the following is the National Sociolinguistic Profile Formula for Israel as formulated according to Ferguson's guidelines:[9]

(1) 2Lmaj+1Lmin+10 L spec[10]

(2) 2S+1 S+10 S

(2a) (Sower+Sgowers)+Sgwe+(8Sgw+1Sgws+1Sgweis)

In detail: 2Lmaj=Hebrew + Arabic

1Lmin=Yddish

10Lspec=(Spanish, Persian, Russian, Polish, Bulgarian, Rumanian, Hungarian, German)+(French)+(English)

1.2. Arabic and Hebrew are both languages of the Semitic family and whcih have had very different histories for largely political reasons. In ~~Israel~~ theory, both may be used in the Knesset (parliament) and the courts, and in approaches to officials. In practice, however, their uses are fairly regularly predictable according to the ethnic or religious background of the speaker; i.e., Arabs, either Moslem or Christian will use Arabic, Jews Hebrew. This includes Jews from Arab countries who have been among the most adamant of the immigrants in their desire to learn and use Hebrew.

The educational system is also divided along similar lines,

Hebrew being the medium of instruction at all levels of Jewish education, while Arabic is used in all Arab institutions. Arab students are required to learn Hebrew from the fourth grade of primary school, and there has recently been debate in favor of making Arabic a compulsory second language for Jewish students. To my knowledge, to date, this plan has not been implemented, though many students voluntarily choose Arabic as a second foreign language. Hebrew is the exclusive language in use in the armed forces, and there are extensive programs to teach Hebrew to immigrants who serve in the army in order to develop a sense of unity.

1.3. Yiddish developed as a dialect of German and is still widely used by Jews throughout the world as a lingua franca. According to the 1961 census 23% of all Jews in Israel, whose first language was not Hebrew spoke Yiddish as their first language. The total number of Yiddish speakers has not been computed, but one might estimate that at least 25% of the total population of Israel has some speaking knowledge of Yiddish.[11]

1.4. Languages of special status were brought to Israel with the waves of immigrants. The statistics for the Spanish-speaking population are somewhat misleading because Ladino speakers, for statistical purposes, were lumped with the Spanish speakers.

Ladino developed as a dialect of Spanish whose divergence can be roughly compared with that of Yiddish from German.[12] Traditionally, it is the language of the Jews who were expelled from Spain at the time of the Inquisition, the Sefaradim.[13] However, one finds Jews born in such diverse places as

Bulgaria, Greece, Turkey, or Palestine itself, who are native speakers of Ladino. No statistics were available which could differentiate between the number of Ladino speakers from those who, for example, have recently emigrated from South America, and speak one of the Latin American regional dialects of Spanish.

Each of the other special languages is used in the variety that characterized Jewish speakers of the language in its "natural habitat".

1.4.1. English in Israel occupies a position different from the other special status languages for several reasons. First, since the British occupied Palestine for some twenty-five years during the mandate period (1923-48), many older Israelis were exposed to English as the normal business and official language. Most businessmen, Jewish and Arab, who were in the area during the period, speak English fluently.

As a language of wider communication,[14] both within the country and internationally, English is by far the most common. Street signs and most other public announcements;e.g., movie posters, billboards, are printed in Hebrew and English, and the National Telephone Directory has an English edition. The annual Israeli Statistical Abstract appears in a Hebrew-English edition, as did the 1961 census reports. In addition, English is the foreign language most frequently taught in schools.

1.5. Our discussion of second-language maintenance centers around the fact that Israeli youth do not need, as did their

parents, to speak more than one language in order to function in their society. The fact remains, however, that it will take several generations before the complex language situation in the country is eliminated and a "linguistic homogenity" is achieved.

In the mean time, second languages are being perpetuated through varied channels. One, ironically, is through the Israeli government itself. In attempting to allow the immigrant to acclimate slowly to his new surrounding, the government produces a variety of services in many of the various "foreign" languages. News broadcasts in "easy Hebrew", as well as other information disseminated in a "watered down" version of the language also reduce the newcomer's need to acquire any more than a rudimentary knowledge of the language, unless it is essential for his work, etc.

1.5.1. In this section we shall examine some of the conditions that serve to perpetuate these second-languages. A major factor in second-language maintenance in Israel, as well as in any other "immigrant-host" (Fishman, 1968) situation, is the existence of "foreign community ghettos" functioning within the state. An interesting datum related to this, which came from the 1961 census, is a chart called "Jews (aged 2 and over) by language spoken (other than Hebrew) and Sub-District", (Vol. 15). Though the precise details of this datum are beyond the scope of this work, the following generalities may be interpreted.[15] 1. "Pockets of Yiddish speakers clus-

ter in the major urban centers of Jerusalem, Haifa, and Tel Aviv, while their diffusion through the rest of the country is nowhere near as frequent; 2. The diffusion of Arabic speakers is quite even throughout the country; 3. Speakers of "Ashkenazi" extraction tend to be found in major urban areas while "Sefaradim" are more evenly distributed throughout the country.[16]

In general, what this means is that the "Ashkenazi" groups tend to have a better opportunity to perpetuate the use of their languages (Yiddish, German, Russian, Polish, etc.), than would the "Sefaradim", (Arabic, Ladino, Kurdish, etc.).[17]

1.5.2. Another set of statistics that substantiates the conclusions reached in the preceding section is found in the data for foreign-language publications.[18]

Among the daily papers, 11 are published in various "Ashkenazi" languages, while only two "Sefaradic" language papers, both in Arabic, appear.

Of the 94 "General and Political Publications", 38 appear in "A" languages, while only 13 appear in "S" languages.

1.5.3. Kol Yisrael, the government operated radio, broadcasts daily in several languages, other than Hebrew. The breakdown here, however, seems to contradict the data shown in the two preceding sections.

There are four broadcast "networks" one of which transmits exclusively in Arabic. (This, however, is primarily for propaganda purposes as these programs are aimed at neighboring Arab countries as well as for local consumption.)

In addition to these full-time Arabic broadcasts, there are also daily programs in English, Yiddish, Ladino, Rumanian, Hungarian, Spanish, Moroccan-Arabic (Jewish version), Persian, French, and Russian. These programs "are intended mainly for new immigrants. Newscasts and commentary..., alternate with popular music, educational programs, Hebrew-language lessons, and comical entertainment."[19] At present the only non-Hebrew program seen on the Israeli television is a two hour broadcast on varied subjects in Arabic, shown between 6 and 8 PM. [A controversy grew up around one of them, a children's show, which became quite popular with Hebrew speaking children, who complained that they could not understand the Arabic. It was decided, however, not to provide sub-titles, as this would provide grounds for a complaint on the part of the Arabs that they could not understand the Hebrew broadcasts, necessitating provision of Arabic sub-titles. This, the broadcasting authority declared, would be too costly and decided to maintain the status quo].

1.5.4. In addition to the above mentioned "formal" mechanisms for second language perpetuation, there are also possibly more important factors that contribute to this perpetuation.

1.5.4.1. Throughout Israel there exist communities who function as economic cooperatives and have a distinctive type of communal living arrangement. These are the kibbutzim and moshavim, most of which have been founded by ideologically homogeneous groups such as political parties with the idea of es-

tablishing a closed, "utopian" society for the perpetuation of their beliefs. Understandably, many of these settlements are comprised of populations of immigrants who came to Israel either in a group, or from a specific area. These communities, most of which are as large as several hundred inhabitants, have a definite "flavor" which reflects the country of origin of the members. In this atmosphere the adult members may feel no urgency to learn Hebrew, though all of the children are educated in the language. New immigrants, looking for a place to "fit in" immediately will seek out these communities, thus perpetuating the use of the native language. I was, unfortunately, unable to find any statistics on the population of these communities.

1.5.4.2. In addition to actual "closed" living units, each city or town has unofficial organizations which, with or without intending to do so, serve to perpetuate the individual linguistic practices of the community.

Synagogues in Israel are not the combination prayer-social meeting places they are in the United States. Their almost exclusive purpose is as a house of worship. As is expected, however, even this worship within the same religion has different traditions and customs depending upon those of the geographic location of the founders of the synagogue. It follows then, that individuals of similar backgrounds would gather to pray according to these customs which they recognize best. Not only does this continue the traditions of the

various pronunciations of Classical Hebrew, but the social interaction that obviously cannot be avoided in this type of setting works to maintain the status quo of the speaker's particular language situation.

Such organizations as "immigrants' clubs" also flourish in Israel. Groups from many nations maintain formal organizations to help new immigrants and allow veterans to meet new people of similar backgrounds. The impact of these groups on the language situation is quite obvious.

There are many less formal organizations, such as chess clubs, sports clubs, literary groups, etc., whose members, understandably choose to consort with "their own kind", often because of the difficulty of expressing or discussing something they had learned in their youth, in their native language, in Hebrew. Among the younger generation, however, this practice is unquestionably disappearing.

2. There are four main varieties of Hebrew in common usage in Israel in a situation that is "diglossic"* in nature. The first three of these may be classified as Modern Hebrew. This group includes the two major native spoken dialects, General Israeli and Oriental Israeli, as well as Modern Literary Hebrew.[20] The other variety, for the sake of simplicity, will be called Classical Hebrew.[21] Of course, the formulation of definite "boundaries" among the various varieties, as well as the styles and levels which are covered by these general terms, are impossible to define absolutely. Nevertheless, an attempt

* See footnote 45, and section 4.3.5.

to describe the most general points of each will be made.

2.1. Before our discussion of the varieties of Hebrew, a brief summary of the story of the revival of the modern language seems in order.

Hebrew died out as a spoken language in Palestine about 200 C.E.,[22] though it never ceased to be used as a medium of written communication. Its revival as a spoken language, began in earnest in the 1880's, was accomplished largely through the efforts of Eliezer bdn-Yehuda and his followers, in connection with their interest in the foundation of a Jewish homeland. Their efforts followed a century of a more-or-less non-related (to the Zionist cause) secular reawakening of literary Hebrew in Central and Eastern Europe, which was the geographic origin of ben-Yehuda and most of his followers. This accounted for a strong non-Semitic influence on the Hebrew which they were to propagate. A good description of the situation at the time is given by Blanc (1968):

> As in other cases in which no dialect is naturally dominant and available for ready imitation, usage had to be established by a gradual and complex process of selection and accomodation... Phonology and morphophonemics were anchored partly in a compromise between two traditional pronunciations, partly in the phonetic habits of the first non-Hebrew speaking generation. Morphology was essentially Biblical, with post-Biblical features persisting in certain literary styles... Syntax was composite and showed strong European influences. The basic vocabulary was Biblical, but the total vocabulary had strong admixtures from later Hebrew, and, whether as loans or loan-translations, much that was common European.[23]

2.2. A brief description of the "two traditional pronuncia-

tions" mentioned above may be found in an article by Morag.[24] The terminology used here is the type that is familiar primarily to Hebraists, but more general explanatory notes have been added in parentheses. Since the Hebrew orthographic system is close to a morphophonemic analysis of the system, the graphemes mentioned correspond to "real" units in the language.

According to Morag the main features of Ashkenazi pronunciation of the orthographic system are: "distinction between qāmēṣ and pathaḥ (morphophonemic long and short /a/), as well as between ṣerī and s^{e}ghol (morphophonemic long and short /e/); realization of the qāmēṣ as [o] or [u] (depending on the Yiddish substratum involved); no regular realization of the s^{ve}wa mobile; realization of the hard t as [t] and the soft t as [s] (related to the phonotactics); no pharyngeals and no emphatics; no gemination; stress usually non-ultimate."

The same author lists the main features of the Sefaradi pronunciation as: "pronunciation of qāmēṣ as pathaḥ; i.e., as an [a] , and of ṣerī as s^{e}ghol; i.e., as an [e] ; realization of the s^{ve}wa mobile as a short [e] ; realization of the hard t as [t] and the soft t as either [θ] or [t] ; preservation of the pharyngeals and of some emphatics."

2.3. The decision whether to institute the Ashkenazi or Sefaradi pronunciation traditions into Modern Hebrew, as it was to be spoken in the State of Israel, was the subject of much debate among the revivers of the language.[25] The choice was

finally made in favor of the Sefaradi tradition as it was felt that the Ashkenazi provided too strong a reminder of the days of suffering in Eastern Europe.[26]

In reality, however, each of the groups that came to Israel added some feature to the modern language which reflected the substrata effects of its native language. Therefore, the Hebrew heard in Israel in 1971 is quite different from what was characterized in section 2.2. as "Sefaradi Hebrew". 2.4. The most clearly standardized of the four types of Hebrew found in current usage in Israel is the Classical. The reasons for this are transparent, since the Classical form of expression is "frozen" in the Torah and other early writings. Rabin dates the fixation of the language of the most widely distributed version of the Old Testament about 900 CE.[27]

Though there exist, as mentioned above, traditional phonological representations of this form, for our purposes, a few morphologic and syntactic divergences from the modern spoken forms will serve to illustrate the major differences between Modern Spoken Hebrew and Classical Hebrew.

A significant feature which clearly distinguishes Classical Hebrew from Modern Spoken Hebrew is the "favored sentence type". In Classical Hebrew, like Classical Arabic, the usual order is Verb-Subject-Object, whereas Modern Spoken Hebrew shows an overwhelming preference for the Subject-Verb-Object order.[28] Another feature of Classical Hebrew which is not manifested in Modern Spoken Hebrew is the "waw-consecu-

tive" construction. This involves the prefixing of the CH phoneme /w/, which is always realized as [v] in Modern Spoken Hebrew, to the "imperfect" form of the verb to give a "perfect" tense meaning, and vice versa.[29]

Finally, the suffixation of the personal pronouns to verbal forms to denote the object of the action of the verb is a feature commonly found in Classical Hebrew which is absent in Modern Spoken Hebrew.

2.5. Modern Literary Hebrew is generally considered to have evolved as a written form in about 1750 CE.[30] Unfortunately this body of literature has been largely neglected as a source for linguistic investigation and, therefore, will be discussed among the topics for further discussion.

2.6. As mentioned in section 2.3. the Sefaradi "dialect" of Hebrew was chosen as the model for the form of speech which the revivers planned to propagate in the Jewish homeland.[31] As also mentioned in this section, the Hebrew usually heard on the streets of Israel differs from the traditional Sefaradi pronunciation as the result of the substratum effect and because of the natural processes of phonological split-and-merger and levelling that all natural languages undergo over time.

To illustrate the divergences of GI and OI from the tradition, the following chart from Morag will be reproduced.[32] (See Plate No. 1, p. 17a and 17b.)

In the same article Morag goes on to point out other significant divergences such as the occurrance in Modern Spoken

The Phonemes	Traditional Sefaradi Pronunciation	GI	OI
I. VOWELS			
1. historical qāmeṣ ((long /a/))	[a] as pathaḥ (short /a/)	[a] as pathaḥ	[a] as pathaḥ
2. historical ḥōlām ((long /o/))	[o]	[o]	[o]
3. historical ṣērī ((long /e/))	e as s^{e}ghōl, both when the ṣerī is followed in the orthography by a yōdh and when it is not followed by a yōdh	e as s^{e}ghōl, but usually only when the ṣerī is not followed by a yōdh; a ṣerī followed in the orthography by a yōdh is usually pronounced [ei]	e as s^{e}ghōl usually both when the ṣerī is followed by a yōdh and when it is not followed by a yōdh*
4. the s^{ve}wa	the regular parallel, according to traditional rules, is a short [e] or an [a]	no regular parallel; existing parallels vary between zero and [e], and their occurrance is to be explained by the phonemic rules of Israeli Hebrew	as in "General Israeli" Hebrew (in most subvarieties of "Oriental" IH)
II. CONSONANTS			
1. the pharyngeals /^{c}/ and /h/	exist in most varieties	replaced by /'/ (or zero) and by /x/ respectively	exist
2. /w/	[w]**	[v]	[v]
3. /r/	lingual [r]	mostly velar [r]	lingual [r]
4. the emphatics:			
a) /ṣ/	pronounced emphatically: [ṣ]	pronounced as the affricate [ts]	pronounced as the affricate [ts]
b) /ṭ/	pronounced emphatically [ṭ]	pronounced [t]	pronounced [t]
c) /q/	pronounced emphatically [q]#	pronounced [k]	pronounced [k]
5. soft /t/	pronounced [θ] or [t]	pronounced [t]	pronounced [t]
CONSONANTAL ALLOPHONES			
gemination	extant according to historical rules	non-extant (in its traditional sense)	as in "General" Israeli Hebrew (in most subvarieties of "Oriental" IH)

III. PROSODIC FEATURES

1. stress	ultimate in certain morphological categories; penultimate in others	in most cases ultimate or penultimate in accordance with the traditional Sefaradi pronunciation; penultimate, however, in certain categories in which the traditional Sefaradi stress is ultimate. In some cases, the stress is antepenultimate or preantepenultimate.	usually as in "General" Israeli Hebrew
2. intonation	no intonation extant##	intonation patterns of its own	intonation patterns of its own

---

*Some sub-varieties of "Oriental" IH, however have [ei] for a sēri which is followed by a yōdh.

#Some of the varieties of the Sefaradi pronunciation which have not preserved the emphatics, have [ts] , [t] and [k] as the respective realizations of historical /s/, /t/, and /q/. In a small number of communities (Aleppo; some of the North African communities, /q/ is realized a [ʾ] .

**In some varieties of the Sefaradi pronunciation only; others have v as the realization of historical /w/.

##Traditional Sefaradi pronunciation is primarily, as are all Hebrew traditional pronunciations, the pronunciation of a liturgical form of Hebrew. In its liturgical form, Hebrew is recited according to various traditional melodies; we have, therefore, to do here with musical melodies but not with the linguistic feature of intonation.

Hebrew of initial clusters, which are precluded by the rules of Classical Hebrew, and the introduction of several phonemes which do not appear in Classical Hebrew. Finally he mentions two "new" phonotactic rules: "the voicing of consonants followed by voiced stops or /z/, as well as the unvoicing of some consonants when followed by unvoiced consonants."[33]

2.7. The next section of this paper will deal with the effects of other languages on Modern Spoken Hebrew. (The discussion is restricted here to Modern Spoken Hebrew, though, because of the impossibility of clearly dividing the two, i.e. MLH and CH* some of the phenomena mentioned herein will be attestable to Modern Literary Hebrew as well.)

2.7.1. Two excellent articles on the topic have been written by Haim Blanc of the Hebrew University. The older of these appeared in an Israeli journal Lešonenu la-Am, "Our National Language", which is devoted to scholarly articles concerned with Hebrew and the language problems of the state.

It is titled "La-yesód ha-ʿarví šeba-dibbúr ha-yisraeli," (On the Arabic Element in Israeli Speech),[34] and in the article Blanc discusses the original Arabic words in light of the changes, both phonemic and morphemic, they have undergone in their borrowed form in Hebrew. The words are grouped according to a general "semantic set" such as foods, children's games, blessings and imprecations, etc.

For the most part the article is written in popular terms, but in his summary Blanc touches on some interesting linguis-

* Modern Literary Hebrew and Classical Hebrew

tic points. For example, he establishes that some of the items described are not in general use, but restricted to "specific groups," who use them "for effect".[35] In addition, he concludes that nouns are more resistant to change than verbs, in terms of their merger with the Hebrew phonological and morphological rules. Also, he points out that some of the items have actually come to Hebrew through Standard Arabic, and in fact, are not commonly used by the autocthonous Arabs.

The second article, "Some Yiddish Influences on Israeli Hebrew"[36] is a good deal more interesting because of its greater depth and because of the fact (given that Arabic is a Semitic "sister" of Hebrew), that Yiddish has had, seemingly, a far more comprehensive role in the shaping of Modern Hebrew than Arabic, showing that language contact is even more powerful a force than linguistic familial relationships.

In a more linguistically sophisticated style than the article mentioned above, Blanc sets out with a brief discussion of the levels of Hebrew involved, and while stating that "Elements traceable to Yiddish are present in all varieties and styles," restricts his discussion to "spoken, informal, General Israeli Hebrew."[37]

In the preceding sections it is established that Yiddish influences are visible from the phonology to the "low level" aspect-type distinctions that are made in Modern Spoken Hebrew. It is these "more basic" phenomena found in GI which resemble constructions found in Yiddish and other European languages, but rarely found in Classical Hebrew or other Se-

mitic languages, which indicate a process occurring "that might be called the Europeanization of Israeli Hebrew".[38]

Other manifestations of this "Europeanization" that deserve mention, as pointed out in another article by Blanc[39] are "the increased use of the personal pronoun with the verb (the subject of the Hebrew verb, at least in the 'Past' and 'Future' tenses is indicated within the form, the use of the pronoun is therefore 'redundant'), the word order (see section 2.4.), the discarding of certain forms which distinguish masculine from feminine, the tendency to form the negative of the present tense like that of the past and future..."[40]

2.8. Another topic that deserves mention in this discussion is the introduction of foreign words on a more general level. (cf. the first article mentioned in section 2.7.1.) The original Vaad ha-lashon (see note 34), had been highly idealistic, issuing such statements as " ' non-Semitic words, even such as accepted in all Indo-European languages' are not to be introduced into usage."[41] This injunction, however, never stopped the phenomenon of linguistic borrowing, both direct and secondary from taking place. Such items as "telephone," "television," "radio", and "university," modified to fit Modern Spoken Hebrew phonological and morphological rules, are common words.

Another interesting phenomenon is the existence of items borrowed from non-Semitic origins which are currently in competition with Hebrew words. An example of this is "taxi" which

seems to be in "free variation" with the Hebrew /monít/. There seems to be no way to predict at this time whether one of these will eventually win out.

2.9. Finally, it has been noted that certain special interest groups within the Israeli society have gone to particular languages for their borrowings. For example, Blanc cites Altbauer's findings that the nautical and fishing terms used by Israeli fishermen are "largely of Italian origin."[42]

Also I have observed, though strictly impressionistically, that among young Israeli musicians (16 to 30 years), the overwhelming majority of their "technical" vocabulary has been borrowed from English, though I have been unable to differentiate between American or British usage.[43]

The same observation has been noted in my casual relationships with members of Israel's "underground" or "head" population.[44]

The entire question of jargon, however, requires much deeper study, the nature of which will be discussed later.

2.10. Finally, in our attempt to give shape to the Israeli Language Situation a look at the work of the Hebrew Language Academy and the place of orthoepic discussions of Modern Hebrew in general seems suitable.

Though the Academy concerns itself mostly with "lexical" questions, a major question that had to be settled, if there were to be any standard form of written Hebrew, was that of spelling. In almost all Modern Literary Hebrew texts (except those intended for new readers of Hebrew), only conso-

nants are written, with the vowels left to the intuition of the reader. To facilitate matters a bit, though only after much debate, the Academy, in 1969, adopted the system of "full spelling." In this system the symbols for /ī/ and /ū/ are included with the consonants, which serves to differentiate words that would be otherwise spelled the same.

(The remainder of the material for this section, or so I had hoped, was to be provided by Prof. Chaim Rabin, in conjunction with his part in the "International Program on Language Planning."* Unfortunately, this information was not received in time for inclusion in this paper.)

3. Almost all of the foregoing discussion has been concerned with the Jewish community; we now turn to the language situation of Israel's Arab population. For the sake of brevity, and because the linguistic situation in Arabic has been documented far better than that of Hebrew (see Appendix II), we will not cover this section in as great detail as the previous ones.

3.1. The Arab population now computed as being counted in the "Israeli" population totals about 440 thousand people, according to the figures for 1970. This figure is made up both of Arabs who live in sections that had been included in the Israeli territory since 1948, as well as those living in East Jerusalem, who have been counted in the Israeli statistics since 1967. Roughly this figure includes 329,000 Moslems, 79,000 Christians, and 40,000 Druze, and others.

* Organized through efforts of J. Fishman, C. Ferguson, Bernudd, Das Gupta, & others. 1970 ?

3.2. The "diglossia" situation in Arabic was pointed out in Ferguson's original work on the phenomenon.[45] This phenomenon is the same in Israel as in the Arab world. In brief, two varieties of Arabic, the "Standard" and the "Colloquial", exist side by side in the society, each being used in a specific "function". The Standard is the literary language and the Colloquial is the language of everyday speech.

In an article "The Arabic Koiné", Ferguson expresses an interesting view of the history of this diglossic situation.[46]

He maintains that this situation always existed within Arabic and that, in fact, Colloquial Arabic dialects did not evolve from the Classical or "Standard", but from a koiné that was popularly used within the Arabian Peninsula in much the same relationship with Standard exhibited today by the dialects before the time of the Arab conquests which began in the seventh century, CE.

3.3. As is also well documented (cf. the situation for Hebrew), there exist specific regional definitions of dialects of Colloquial Arabic within the borders of Israel. The major dichotomy is between urban and rural dwellers. In the latter group, an important sub-group is the local Bedouins. One Bedouin dialect group found in the Negev (southern Israel) has been studied carefully by Blanc.[47]

3.3.1. As is often the case , because most studies fall along these lines, a major criteria for distinction among the dialects fall along phonological lines. For example, the fellahîn (rural peasants), regularly exhibit the dialectal

phoneme /$\overset{v}{c}$/ where the city-dweller will show /k/. (The use of "peasant" here denotes an occupational class; i.e., agricultural workers, rather than a social class that might be associated with the term.)

There are also lexical items which readily identify a speaker as hailing from a certain region; e.g., /issa/ 'now' identifies the speaker as from the region around the Sea of Galillee. Most other dialects use /hal'eet/ (or a related form).

3.4. As in the situation of the Hebrew-speaking population, almost no in-depth analysis of the relation between cultural group and languages spoken exists for the Arab population.

The fact is that this language community is only slightly homogeneous, either linguistically, culturally, or as defined by religion. Though the majority is Muslim, several Christian sects, as well as the mysterious Druze, are found within Israel's borders. Among the Christian groups are Catholics, Greek Orthodox, Maronites, (Lebanese Christians) Armenians, and various Protestant sects, each of whom, it seems reasonable to assume, exhibits specific linguistic characteristics not shown by the other groups.

In addition, the Bahai faith has its main center in Haifa, and has attracted numbers of Arabic as well as some Hebrew speakers.

3.4.1. The Druze, because of their unique stature among the "Arabs" of Israel, deserve specific mention.[48]

Practitioners of a religion that holds as one of its

tenets that details of the religion should not be revealed to outsiders, the Druze have allied themselves with the Israeli cause in the political struggle, much to the consternation of their Muslim and Christian Arab neighbors.

As the only Arab group eligible for the Israeli armed forces, the Druze have shown themselves more than willing to defend Israel, as well as to cooperate with the Israeli authorities on other matters. Their "price" is the right to live peacefully in their villages and to practice their religion free from persecution or even undue attention.

What makes the Druze particularly interesting for our discussion is the great desire they have shown to adopt the Hebrew language, at least for "public" purposes. As mentioned before, both Hebrew and Arabic may be used to address the Knesset. The Druze representatives frequently address the body in Hebrew, much to the delight of the government.

4. To organize this section, on suggestions for further study, we return to the outline mentioned in the introduction.

4.1. An adequate overview of the topics that have been examined by sociolinguists may be found in Mathiot (1969).

Though the focus of this work is to point out the lack of "an integrative theory of Sociolinguistics," her critique touches on most of the areas that have been included under the cover "Sociolinguistics." It is recognized, especially of late (cf. Notes from the 24th Georgetown Round Table, in press), that a shifting of the "relative popularity" of some of these topics has occurred. The "validity", of Mathiot's

observations, however, remains unchanged.

I have extracted from the work cited above the following outline. The terminology has been defined in the original work, and therefore these definitions will not be reiterated here.

The outline is accompanied by a listing of relavant preliminary English language works which are representative of research with the focus on Israel.

This seeming paucity of research relating to Israel is somewhat misleading since there has been a good deal of work published in other languages, especially Hebrew, which has not been translated to English.[49]

In addition, the Israeli press is frequently used as a forum for the discussion of the merits of orthoepic statements, which is closely related to the current discussion.[50]

Each item in the outline will be listed and then discussed in light of existing research. Where this research seems inadequate suggestions will be made. In addition, potentially interesting areas for study which I have observed during my visits to Israel will be mentioned.

The purpose of this is to defend my statement (presented in the introduction to this paper) concerning the unusually fertile area of Sociolinguistic study that Israel offers.

(Outline follows, page 27.)

THE OUTLINE	SEE:
I. Microproblems	
II. Macroproblems	
A. Nuclear Problems	
1. Sociolinguistic Profile	1. Blanc (1969) 2. Klausner (1955) 3. Weiman (1950) 4. Bachi (1956)
2. Sociolinguistic Dynamics	
a. Major dimensions of the problem area	
1'. Domains of usage	
2'. Language attitudes and language loyalty	1. Lambert et.al. (1963) 2. Feinberg (1971)* 3. Sekbach (1971)*
3'. Sociolinguistic processes	1. Morag (1959, 1969) 2. Blanc (1954,65,68) 3. Rabin (1970a, b) 4. Pinchover (1971)*
b. Specific Interests	
1'. Special Linguistic Varieties	
a'. Standard language	1. Fishman et al (1971)*
b'. Linguas francas	
c'. Creoles	
d'. baby talk	
2'. Special topics	
a'. Multilingualism	
b'. Diglossia	
c'. Language planning	1. Fishman et al. (1971)*
B. Marginal Problems	
1. Dynamics of Linguistic Change	
2. Acquisition of Linguistic Competance	
3. Linguistic Relativism	

* These articles were included in a list of works to be included in the International Program on Language Planning, which was sent to me in the form of a progress report of the project, by Haim Blanc. Some of these articles may prove my "suggestions for further study" redundant, but I have no way of obtaining this information at this time.

4.2. Microproblems To my understanding, the analysis "linguistic interaction within small groups" essentially deals with the types of occurences which transpire while people are in face-to-face situations.[51]

This situation, and the accompanying set of modifications in linguistic practices, as results from differences in social status, etc., give great insight into the "reality" area of linguistics. (As opposed to the "hypothetical" situations upon which so many linguistic assumptions are made, cf. "the ideal speaker-hearer" which is the basis for so much t-g analysis.)

Because of the many languages in use in regular daily activity, as well as the wide variety of speakers' proficiency in Hebrew, (though Fishman (1968) does count this as an "operative variable") the investigator has the added complexities of analysing a highly heterogeneous speech community.

Though studies in the area of micro-sociolinguistics are so sparse as to necessitate investigations in every area of the world, certainly the complex situation in Israel would provide a good inroad for any linguist, desiring to unravel some of the problems. A detailed follow-up on the types of "family profiles" presented in Appendix 1, done on a much grander and more representative scale, could provide real insight into the question of "who speaks what to whom and when," (from Fishman).

(The importance of methodology is raised here. Since, to the best of my knowledge, there is no standard procedure

to elicit this type of information, an entire battery of screening procedures and questionnaries would have to be formulated. It would seem, however, that these could be easily worked into the type of "community profile" questionnaires devised by Wölck and others[52] for elicitation of related sociolinguistic information which could then be modified to suit the needs of the investigator.)

4.3. Macroproblems

4.3.1. The National Sociolinguistic Profile Formula mentioned previously was, at best, a rudimentary effort. More refined data, expecially as related to dialects, would be helpful (cf. the discussion following the Ferguson article cited). I find the computation of these formulas a potentially valuable method for categorizing similar language situations for the purpose of comparing the success of endeavors like National LANGUAGE planning programs.

In Israel the chief remaining problem is to focus more attention on the non-Jewish population. Otherwise the language statistic investigation has been commendable.

Sociolinguistic Dynamics.

Major Dimensions of the Problem Area, (i.e. sociolinguistic dynamics).

4.3.2. Domains of usage, as a method of analysing the circumstances which result in alterations of an individual's linguistic behavior, has led Fishman to observe, "the appropriate designation and definition of domains of language behavior...calls for considerable insight into the socio-cultur-

al dynamics of particular multilingual speech communities."[53] This must be taken as an understatement where Israel is concerned. The situations illustrated by our exemplary families would certainly illustrate this.

The fact that on any given day a typical Israeli may use several different languages and two or three varieties of Hebrew (depending on whether he is religious), adds up to a highly complex situation for the analyst. The fact that situations like the following occur with relative frequency will, I hope, serve to illustrate this. Stephan R., a fellow student at the Hebrew University, related the following to me when discussing language usage: "Almost every day I speak Yiddish to my grandmother, Swedish with my immediate family, English with my girlfriend, Hebrew with my classmates, Arabic with the newsboy, and study French in the University. Sometimes I really get confused." In addition, as a religious Jew, Stephan recites his daily prayers in Classical Hebrew.

Though this particular situation is perhaps more complex than most, I have heard enough similar versions to warrant its detail. One judgement that must immediately be made is the proficiency of the speaker in a given situation. In Stephan's case, it must be mentioned that his Arabic is limited to routine greetings and simple exchanges of comments about the weather, etc.

With this in mind, I find the following domains to be among the most interesting for study: the home; the worksphere; reading habits; school (both in class and at recess);

religious usage; and the transactional sphere (shopping, etc.).

4.3.3. The question of language attitudes in Israel has been examined in a project by Wallace Lambert, et al., called "Evaluational Reactions of Jewish and Arabic Adolescents to Dialects and Language Variations".[54] In this examination a "matched guise" test was used to determine stereotyped attitudes, as compared to inquiring about the same attitudes using standard measures of attitudes.

The results seem to indicate that the matched-guise gives results of a different nature than the standard measures, but this finding, to my mind, is secondary to the questions that were raised as to the examination methods used. Throughout the paper, the author states that the speakers involved were proficient in Hebrew and Arabic to such a degree that their ethnic identities were undiscernible to "competent" bilinguals, as well as to the Israelis as to the question of Ashkenazi or Sefaradi background.

Unfortunately no mention is made of the linguistic features used, for example, to distinguish the Ashkenazic Hebrew and the "Yemenite Hebrew" speakers who were used for the "dialect difference" portion of the investigation. It would be very interesting to know, in either phonetic, phonemic, morphologic, or syntactic terms exactly how the "Yemenite" dialect of Modern Spoken Hebrew was isolated from any of the other dialects of OI.

The main purpose of the Lambert paper is not to discuss various styles of Hebrew, but to analyse hearers' reactions to the vari-

ous types; however, I feel that the authors could have been a bit more detailed in the explanation of their procedures. I believe that this would have provided a great deal of assistance to linguists who are still looking for methods to accurately discover how distinct linguistic indicies indicate variances in the social structure.

In a closing note on the article, Haim Blanc, in private correspondence, termed it "full of pitfalls", and warned, "...it must be used warily."

As for the topic of language attitudes and language loyalty in general, the Israeli language sociolingusitic function remains virtually an untapped source. It seems that every Israeli has a stereotype of the way a member of any immigrant group other than his own, (or all the groups, if he's a sabra) speaks Hebrew. A thorough examination, using various testing procedures, could prove interesting to determine whether this intuition could be empirically demonstrated as valid. Though Lambert's system is not without flaws, some aspects could be used. Also studies like Wölck's* could give further insight.

The studies of language attitudes are extensive. Fishman gives a comprehensive run down of the studies done through 1970 in the article "Language Attitude Studies."[55] He distinguishes these studies as falling into three main types. "1. those dealing with language-oriented or language-directed attitudes; 2. those dealing with community-wide stereotyped impressions toward particular languages or language varieties (and in some cases, their speakers, functions etc.);

* See footnote 52.

3. those concerned with the implementation of different types of language attitudes."[56] In terms of the Israeli Language Situation, the first type could be used to get popular opinion as to the amount of "foreign" vocabulary that the public considers suitable for use in Modern Spoken Hebrew. These studies seem of limited value, however, since the functions of various styles of Hebrew seem well defined and hardly subject to change. Studies of the second variety could be used to good advantage by the Israeli government in determining popular attitudes for the purpose of formulating propaganda to help create a better understanding of the Arabs and their situation within the State. In addition, a program along similar lines could help reduce some of the "friction" that currently exists between Ashkenazim and Sefaradim. Though this disturbing feature of the Israeli culture is minimized officially, it does exist. A better understanding of the nature of the problem, which I believe could be afforded through these attitude tests, could only work to improve the existing situation. Studies of the third variety could be used to help reduce the anxiety period of immigrants by establishing how to best serve his linguistic needs; for instance, the current programs designed to help immigrants feel at home in Israel while they learn Hebrew, could be used more effectively if the language-maintenance attitudes of each community were investigated and the program planned accordingly.

One other study in this area that deserves mention, if only to show the mistakes that can be made with good data that

was poorly interpreted, is the article "Phonetics, Personality and Status in Israel" by Samuel Z. Klausner.[57] In this article, the author, on the basis of what he seems to consider valid orthoepic statements, describes "some phonetic differences in the Hebrew speech of two levels of Israeli urban society," comparing "the frequency of infantile lisps and gurglings in the phonemes of the two levels," and finally notes "the learning of a peculiar upper social level mispronunciation by the lower level children."[58] The linguistic naïveté shown on the part of the analyst is almost appalling; in Blanc's words, "the terminology used is not calculated to arouse full confidence in Klausner's linguistic training,"[59] but Blanc is being unnecessarily kind. Nevertheless, the work is unique in its attempt to analyse the Israeli Language Situation strictly on the basis of phonetic data, and suggests future work that could be done.

4.3.4. The next item on the outline we are using as our framework is "sociolinguistic processes" which Mathiot defines as "the mechanisms accounting for the various sociolinguistic situations to be observed within a given society."[60] Though this definition suggests a wide variety of factors that might be considered, those particularly related to language maintenance, and the question of uniformity and diversity within a given language are specified.[61]

This area is virtually untouched within the discussion of the Israeli Language Situation. One question that has persisted in my thinking since my first visit to Israel is that of

the emergence of regional, social, or sex-related differences in Modern Spoken Hebrew among sabras. The observation that prompted this was that several girls I had met from a city in north-central Israel, Hadera, seemed to speak a distinct variety of Hebrew characterized by an unusual stress and intonation. I did not test the reasons for this, but I think this type of study could be interesting as related to the other distinctions already made within Modern Spoken Hebrew.

The question of uniformity and diversity have been more closely examined for Arabic than Hebrew as may be observed in section 3. Because the spoken Hebrew situation does not come close to approximating the spoken Arabic in complexity as yet, we have a unique opportunity to observe the phenomena of geographic dialect drift as it virtually begins. This is the result of Hebrew being, to my knowledge, history's first revived language. Given the varieties of Modern Spoken Hebrew, with the varietal distinctions listed herin as "given," it would be possible, on the basis of constant observation, to determine "exactly" how, in what features, and why Modern Spoken Hebrew changes, as all natural languages seem to do.

This testing, however, raises methodological problems. At the moment almost the only tool available is a taxonomic description of specific divergent features. What I am postulating is a type of codified index for specific features of language that could be used to reference language in general, or at least those of a certain type. Such features as favored sentence type, affixing v. root-and-pattern grammatical struc-

tures, placement of attributes, etc., are all regular enough occurrences to allow such categorization. The development of such a code system would allow the linguist to "keep track" of linguistic change in a systematic fashion and reduce some of the confusion caused by the present necessity to rely on area specialists, whose jargon may be more confusing than elucidating.

Specific Interests.

Special Linguistic varieties.

4.3.5. The question of standard language in Israel presents a difficult problem for the analyst in defining Modern Literary Hebrew, as was hinted at earlier in section 2.4. The reason for this is that an author may choose from styles as divergent as Biblical and Modern Spoken Hebrew to express his thoughts. "The Hebrew of today...conforms to the principle established by the stylistic revolution since 1885, linked with the name of satirist Mendele Mokher Sefarim (1836-1917), by which material from any period of the language could be freely combined; but it does not continue the mixture as used by Mendele. By being an entirely new combination of divergent older materials, it manages both to be an autonomous linguistic system and to be recognizably like the language of those older periods."[62]

In other words, according to Rabin, Modern Literary Hebrew can encompass any feature of any style of Hebrew throughout its 3,000 year history and, theoretically, any new features introduced through the modern spoken language. It is

obvious, however, that certain trends in usage must exist, and it is these which should come under linguistic scrutiny. To my knowledge there have been no general examinations of this sort, though the works of certain authors, notably S. I. Agnon who won the Nobel Prize for literature in 1966, have been examined.[63]

What seems to be a gargantuan task is simplified somewhat with the realization of two points made by Garvin (in private conversation): 1. that Hebrew's 1,500 year dormant period significantly reduced the amount of change the language underwent, as compared to languages that were "alive" during the same period; and 2. that the literature that emerged from this period was quite restricted in its breadth of subject-expression; i.e., that writings of the period were usually liturgical or philosophical and not "imaginative" (belles lettres). These works tend to be of the "automatized" nature, and thus far more subject to a straight-forward analysis on all levels of the language.[64]

Only with the above mentioned facts in mind can statements like Rabin's (on the preceding page, note 62) be judged as accurate. The systematic study of Modern Literary Hebrew as a standard language should reveal features that relate closely with those of any dynamic standard, depending on the style of literature (journalistic, poetic, scientific, etc.) under examination.

Related to the standard language question is the "diglossia" phenomenon (mentioned before in relation to Arabic),

noted by Ferguson, (fn. 45).

This phenomenon is readily observable in Hebrew. One major difference from the original model that Ferguson presented is that in Hebrew there are three distinct varieties as opposed to Ferguson's "high" and "low" dichotomy. The specific functions of the three varieties are: Modern Spoken Hebrew, normal daily speech, cartoons, classroom discussions, etc.; Modern Literary Hebrew, newspapers, most secular writing, newscasts, most popular songs; Classical Hebrew, prayer, liturgical writing.

A major problem is presented by the difficulty in strictly dividing Modern Literary Hebrew and Classical Hebrew. What is needed is a thorough investigation of the modern written language to determine exactly how it diverges from the Classical.

4.3.6. In the discussion of the use of lingua francas in Israel, we are immediately confronted with the question of the definition of the term. Samarin[65] adopted a loose definition as stated by UNESCO: "A language which is used habitually by people whose mother tongues are different in order to facilitate communication between them."

Under this definition we would have to classify Hebrew as a lingua franca since, in 1960, over half the population was foreign born, and hence, Hebrew is not their mother tongue. This solution seems somewhat less than adequate, however, when it is remembered that almost 80% of this same Israeli population listed using Hebrew as their normal daily language. (Z.1.)

A refinement of this definition, then, seems appropriate. A more precise definition would add "...and is not a common language in daily use throughout the country."

According to this definition, then, the only language that truly qualifies as a lingua franca is English (see 1.4.1.), though French might be considered.[66]

There are no "pidgin" languages currently in use in Israel, though there are certainly wide discrepencies in proficiency among the users of the various languages. Neither are there any "creoles".

4.3.7. The study of baby talk as a topic of linguistic investigation has been primarily undertaken by Ferguson (1964). This topic, too, could be significantly advanced if studied in light of the Israeli situation. The prospect of analysing baby talk as it begins in a language (there is no documented baby talk anywhere in Hebrew literature from any period), certainly would be interesting for anyone interested in this phenomenon. No study of Hebrew baby talk has been investigated, though, as discovered through casual inquiries, it does seem to be developed. Conversely observations could be made on the effect of Israeli baby talk on the language of adults, as it seems to be the case, ultimately, that adults "invent" baby talk, while babies simply perform their interpretation of the parent's speech.*

Special Topics.

4.3.8. Multilingualism, as a topic of linguistic investigation, is virtually wide open as an area of study. An extremely

*Paul Garvin, in private conversation, pointed out the fact that the question must be raised here whether MSH is, in fact, a "complete" language or whether there are additional facets

interesting analysis of the situation in Israel has been carried out by Simon Herman[67] primarily directed toward the question of language choice. In the study, Herman not only delineates some of the influencing factors affecting language choice in a multilingual setting, but cites a detailed case study of the experiences of an English speaking immigrant and the language related experiences of his stay.

A study which I think would be interesting, though related to the one mentioned above, would be a detailed analysis using Kloss' variables for multilingual community typology.[68] This, however, would require in-depth statistical analysis pertaining to language of a more extensive nature than even the 1961 census.

Israel's existence as a highly multilingual society is well-documented; the only question is for the analyst to decide which aspect of this he wants to investigate.

The problem of <u>diglossia</u> has been mentioned in the section on standard language and will not be repeated.

4.3.9. The question of language planning has been the subject of a recent extensive study in Israel as related to the "International Program on Language Planning" carried out by Fishman, Ferguson, Rubin, das Gupta, and Jernudd. I prefer to wait until the findings of this group are published, rather than make general comments at this time.

4.4. Marginal Problems.

4.4.1. The study of the dynamics of linguistic change has received great attention from Labov,* and rightfully so. It

* See footnote 70.

is this area, to my mind, which is crucial to Sociolinguistics. The phrase "linguistic change," to my understanding, though, is somewhat more specific than the concept usually referred to by linguists. This is the result of my understanding to include the variable "time" in the observation. That is, there must be an "earlier" and "later" set of observations from which to judge this change.

Because of the relatively limited inventory of items at the phonological level, most of the discussion of "linguistic change" has been focused on the level of language. This does not seem unjustified in the additional fact that phonological data is easy to elicit and observe, through tapes, while changes in grammatical usage are much harder to pinpoint.

In terms of research done on Hebrew, Klausner has pointed out an interesting phenomenon. Namely, that apical [r] , which is characteristic of OI is gradually being replaced by a uvular variety which is manifested in GI. What makes this even more surprising is that the former variety is considered more "purely Semitic" by orthoepists. Klausner relates this to the relatively lower status of OI, if we accept the generalities of linguistic attitudes as stated in this article.[69]

On the grammatical level it would be interesting to note the exact influence of the phenomenon of Europeanization mentioned above. Analytical tools for analysis of this problem, developed by Labov in his New York study,[70] and I believe these could be adopted, with certain modifications to consider Israel's rural-agricultural sectors as well as the urban centers

for which the study was designed. Another interesting study of this type was done by Friedrich.[71]

4.4.2. The acquisition of linguistic competence is a topic usually given to the area of Psycholinguistics, but in the Israeli situation, it could prove an interesting study from one particular point of investigation; namely, the effect of a highly multilingual situation on this acquisition. This type of study could be carried out particularly well in a closed society like a kibbutz, but to my knowledge, none has ever been undertaken.

4.4.3. Linguistic relativism refers to the belief that the language spoken effects the perception of the world by the speaker; i.e., the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. Studies in this area are extremely limited, especially within the literature of Sociolinguistics. The suggestions made by Hymes,[72] however, indicate that it too is an area for which Israel would prove a good source of data.

APPENDIX I

I present here an informal discussion of language usage in various Israeli households which I had the opportunity to observe during eighteen months in Israel. In each case the place of birth of the parents (when known) will be mentioned, and the approximate date of their arrival in Israel. The common sociological terms are used with their connotations relative to our society. No investigation of the "class membership" of any of the families mentioned has been done.

A. Family W. lives in a middle-class section of Jerusalem. The family is composed of five members. Mr. W. is a retired Post Office employee. Born and educated in Poland, he came to Palestine in about 1930 at the age of eighteen. Trained as an engineer, he worked with the British in this capacity in the Post Office until the British withdrawal in 1947. He continued this job with the Israeli government until 1971. He is literate in Hebrew, Yiddish, Polish, Russian, and English. According to his own evaluation, he speaks all of these languages fluently except English, and this he attributes to lack of practice. His Hebrew must be classified GI.

Mrs. W. was born in Palestine in approximately 1920. Before her children were born, she worked in the Post Office with the British, where she learned to speak, read, and write English fluently, a level which she has maintained. In addition, having been brought up in the Old City of Jerusalem, she speaks the local colloquial dialect of Arabic fluently, though she is illiterate in this language. Her mother tongue

is Ladino, her parents being of Sefaradic background. Her education was in Hebrew which, of course, she speaks and writes fluently, speaking a generally OI dialect.

The three children are aged 29, 25, and 22. The eldest, a girl, is married and now has young children of her own. The other two are sons. All of the children, until the last five years, were monolingual, speaking GI Hebrew exclusively in the home and for all other social functions, perhaps other than to give an occasional tourist directions. Then, in about 1967, with the growing popularity of the Beatles and other English speaking groups, the younger son, who is an artist and actor began to seek out Americans with whom he could "practice his English". By 1971 he was speaking fairly fluent English, capable of carrying on conversations on a wide number of topics. He is, however, still illiterate in this language.

In 1968 the elder son came to the United States where he presently works for El Al Airlines and attends New York University. His achievement in English has been commendable and, except for his accent, he could be informally classified a native speaker of "standard American."

The daughter spent two years with her husband in the United States where he is studying. Upon her return to Israel I observed that her English was still quite poor, though she is now returning to the United States to join her husband who has recently completed his Ph.D.

B. Family P. lives in a middle-class neighborhood in Tel Aviv. Mr. P. was born in Poland in 1914 and came to Palestine

at the age of 19. All of his early years were spent in agricultural settlements with other members of the youth group with whom he came to Palestine. He received only elementary education in Poland, but also studied in a "cheder" (Hebrew school), and could read the language when he arrived. Most of the people on the various agricultural settlements (kibbutzim) were also from Eastern Europe, and Yiddish was the major spoken language.

Mrs. P's background is virtually the same as her husband's except that she is six years younger. They met on one of the kibbutzim and following their marriage, decided to come to Tel Aviv. Here they opened a small store and Mr. P. painted houses to augment his income. In Tel Aviv, for the first time, as Mr. P. related, there was, at least, a covert coercion to speak Hebrew.

The P.'s have three daughters, ages 26,22, and 18. All three have been educated exclusively in Hebrew, though all three took English and French as second languages in high school. The two elder girls have traveled outside Israel. The eldest has lived with her Israeli husband for two years in Belgium, and thanks to her Yiddish-speaking background, has, according to the family, begun to speak Flemish quite well. Of the other daughters, the elder speaks some English, and the youngest is monolingual.

Both Mr. and Mrs. P. are literate in Polish, Yiddish, and Hebrew, though by their own admission, are not as "strong" in their spoken Hebrew as they'd like to be.

The normal patterns of discourse in the home are: a) if initiated by

one of the parents; shorter phrases or simple question are spoken in Hebrew, while longer, more complex utterences, whether statements or questions, are spoken in Yiddish; b) the children, whether addressed in Yiddish or Hebrew, always answer in Hebrew, unless they wish to make some type of "snide" remark or to mimic their parents. The only one of the children, in fact, to profess any knowledge of Yiddish is the eldest.

All members of the family speak GI.

C. Family M. Lives in a new, upper-class section of Jerusalem. Both Mr. and Mrs. M. were born in the United States and were graduated from American Universities. They came to Israel for the first time in 1951 when Mr. M. was a visiting professor at the Hebrew University. Having decided to emigrate, they returned to the United States for two years, 1953-54, but have been in Israel ever since.

Mr. M., aside from English, is literate in, and can get along speaking, French and German. He also speaks Yiddish but not fluently. In addition, he has recently undertaken learning Arabic in one of the Israeli-run adult education courses. As a lecturer at the Hebrew University, Mr M. is required to, and in fact does, speak fluent, though somewhat "bookish" Hebrew, as well as being literate in the language. His ideolect falls into the GI category.

Mrs. M. is a high school English teacher. Her Hebrew, though fluent, is marked with a heavy American accent which precludes her being classed, though her husband children are, as a native speaker of Hebrew.

All of the three M. children, a girl aged 24, a boy 19, and another girl 18, were born in the United States. All three speak English natively, as this is the main language spoken in the home. They are all, in addition, bilingual in Hebrew, this being the main language of social intercourse with their friends, who, by their own statement, consider the M. children Sabras (native Israelis).

Of the three children, only one, the youngest, has a slight accent in English. Her grammer, however, is native American, and I can only recall one instance of an inability to produce a lexical item, the situation having been an Israeli child asking her the English translation of the Hebrew word for "scorpion" which she did not know.

D. The information on family Y. was supplied by the youngest son who is currently touring the United States. My Y. was born in Aden in about 1905. A merchant-trader, he traveled extensively through the Mid-East and into India. His son related that his father usually spoke Arabic with his friends, (and was literate) though he declared quite insistently that he remembers his father speaking English with his father's late brother. Mr. Y. apparently used English as his regular language of business, as the British influence in the area was, and still is, quite widespread. Though not a practicing Jew, Mr. Y. was trained in Hebrew and could read and make his way speaking the language when he arrived in Palestine in 1940. In addition, according to the son, Mr. Y. speaks "Kochini", which is a popular Israeli designation for Malayalam, a language he used in his

trading in India. His literacy in this language could not be verified.

As a traditional "Oriental" wife, Mrs. Y. had no formal education. Fifteen years younger than her husband, she accompanied him to Palestine, having married him three years earlier. She spoke the Aden dialect of colloquial Arabic, and learned to converse in Hebrew, but remains illiterate in both languages.

There are five children in the family. The eldest, a son, was a year old when his parents brought him to what was then Palestine. There is also a son aged 30, two daughters, aged 28 and 26, and the youngest, who provided this information, aged 24.

All of the children are products of Hebrew education. Except for some conversational knowledge of Arabic, they are monolingual in OI Hebrew with the exception of the youngest, who speaks some English. As he learned the language through strictly informal channels, he is illiterate.

One may infer from the foregoing section that there is a definite correlation between age, or "generation membership" and the number of languages spoken within the Israeli society. This might seem predictable given that most of the "older" generation came to speak Hebrew as a second language. Nevertheless, if the "cases" are closely examined it will be seen that Hebrew was, in most cases, learned not as a second language, but often as a third or fourth.

In any case, there is no question that the native-born Israeli, unless he has traveled extensively outside the coun-

try, tends to be monolingual. This seems to be a result of the overwhelming success of the program that instituted Hebrew as the Israeli national language, and a strong negative effect which is associated with most foreign languages.

In closing this section, it must be noted that the examples given are not to be taken as a microcosm of Israeli society. For example, all of the families cited are city dwellers, though this is certainly not the case for the population as a whole. The purpose of the section was to give some concrete examples of the differences in the language-generation relationships.

APPENDIX II *

Listed below is a brief bibliography intended to give the reader an idea of the nature of existant linguistic works on Arabic.

1. Anīs, Ibrahīm, 1965,"Fi al-Lahajat al-'Arabīyah." ("On the Arabic Dialects"), 3rd ed.. Cairo, Anglo-Egyptian Bookstore.

2. Chejne, Anwar, G. 1965,"Arabic: Its Significance and place in Arab Muslim Society", Middle East Journal, XIX. 447-70.

3. Cowell, Mark, W. 1964, "A Reference Grammer of Syrian Arabic," Georgetown Arabic Series 7. Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Press.

4. Johnstone, T. M., 1967, "Eastern Arabian Dialect Studies." London Oriental Series, Vol. 17, London, Oxford University Press.

5. Sobleman, ed., 1962."Arabic Dialect Studies." Washington, D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics.

*Addendum:

Bateson, Mary Catherine. Arabic Language Handbook. Language Handbook Series. Center for Applied Linguistics. Washington, DC. 1967.

NOTES

1. Blanc, "Dialect Research in Israel", Orbis, 5.185

2. Mathiot, M., "The Current State of Sociolinguistics in the United States", in Man, Language, and Society, ed. Ghosh, S., Mouton: The Hague, pp. 168-178.

3. Language, Literacy and Educational Attainment; Data from Stage "B" of the Census; Vol. 15, (1963), 29 (1966) and 30 (1966), Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics.

4. Unquestionably the major factor was the June War of 1967. Many population trends were altered drastically. Among the Jewish population "...the total figures for immigration, which had dropped seriously from 1963-67, rose again each year from 1967 until it reached a total of some 40,000 in 1969...the total immigration in the twenty years 1948-68 was 1,300,000." Bentwich, Norman, Israel: Two Fateful Years, Elek Books Ltd., London, 1970; pp. 26-36.
   The problem of the citizenship status of the Palestinian Arabs is not within the scope of this work. The fact that this status is unresolved and an area of debate crucial to the solution of the political question is sufficiently controversial to convince me to avoid the issue completely by not including these "People without a country" anywhere in the discussion.

5. An example of the application of NSPF may be found in Ferguson, "The Role of Arabic in Ethiopia", in Report of the 21st Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies; James E. Alahs, ed., Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C., 1970.

6. An important feature of the Israeli language situation that does not become obvious anywhere in this discussion, yet which is extremely important, is the existence of numerous dialects of the various languages under investigation. Though the topic theoretically should be included in this section, because of the lack of research in the area, it will be discussed among the "suggestions for further study."

7. Ferguson, Ibid, p.2.

8. The distinction between "everyday" language and "main" language was not clearly drawn in the census report.

9. For those readers not familiar with the terminology that follows, a brief description is:
   Major Language spoken natively by more than 25% of population, is the official language of country, and/or is the language of education of over 50% of the secondary school graduates; (Major Language; L maj.); Minor Language (L min) spoken natively by no more than 25% of the

population and by either more than 5% or 100,000+people, and/or is used as a medium of instruction above the first years of primary school, having textbooks other than primers published in it; Special Language (L spec) does not fall into the two preceding catefories and is widely used in one or more of the following ways: (a) for religious purposes, (b) for literary purposes within the country, (c) taught as a subject in secondary schools, (d) as a lingua franca within the country, (e) as a major language for an age-sector of the population, (f) see note 10.

The capital "S" refers to a Standard Language; i.e., a language for which grammers have been written and there is an accepted writing system.

The lower case letters refer to the following:
g-marks an "identifiable group" within the country
o-used officially in government, education or military
w-used for wider communication within the country
e-used for educational purposes
r-used for religious purposes
i-used for wider communication internationally
s-widely studied as a school subject

10. The following refinement of the term "special language" seems suitable for the Israeli situation; namely, that the language is spoken natively by at least 2% of the population and is the medium of a regular publication in the country.

11. It is not unusual to find, in the major Arab shopping districts such as the market in the Old City of Jerusalem, Arab merchants who speak some Yiddish, at least enough for purposes of haggling.

12. This divergence is characterized by a large Hebrew influence on the lexicon and a significantly different phonology. See, Kloss, H. Die Entstehung Neur Germanischer Kulturspachen, 1850-1950; Munich, Pohl, 1950.

13. Also spelled "Sepharadim". This epithet is usually given to all Jews of "Oriental" origin, as opposed to Ashkenazim, who are, traditionally, the Jews who came from the countries of Eastern Europe. The differences in the traditional pronunciation of "Ashkenazi" Hebrew versus "Sefaradi" Hebrew will be discussed in section 2.2.

14. Fishman, J., "National Languages and Languages of Wider Communication in the Developing Nations", in Anthropological Linguistics, April, 1969, pp. 111-135.

15. As a bit of statistical background; according to the 1970 figures, over half the population (total) lived in the three districts, Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, and Haifa. Of this

group over 90% live in urban as opposed to rural settlements. These trends should have been equally as true in 1961 as at the present.

16. The 1970 Statistical Abstract has among the foreign-born; 704,000 born in Europe and America, and 674,600 in Asia and Africa, (for 1960 these were 668,000 and 526,700). The former group, in general, may be called "Ashkenazi" and the latter "Sefaradi".

17. "Arabic" here comprises especially the "Jewish" forms of the colloquial varieties brought to Israel with the immigrants.

18. Newspapers and Periodicals Appearing in Israel, State of Israel Government Press Office, 1966.

19. Area Handbook for Israel, . 231.

20. Hereafter GI, OI, and MLH. The first two terms are from Blanc, 1968. In addition, MSH will be used to signify Modern Spoken Hebrew; i.e., GI and OI. The distinction between MSH and Modern Hebrew (MH), should be kept clear as the latter includes MLH.

21. What is conveniently called Classical Hebrew (CH) here is really quite a complex group of varieties of Hebrew which covered a period of over a thousand years of written tradition. For a more complete discussion of the Hebrew of this period see Rabin's article on Hebrew in Sebeok's Current Trends in Linguistics, vol. 6, 1970.

22. Rabin, "Hebrew", in Trends in Linguistics, Vol. VI, ed. Sebeok; Mouton, The Hague, p. 324.

23. Blanc, "The Israeli Koiné as an Emergent National Standard" in Fishman and das Gupta, eds., Language Problems of Developing Nations, Wiley Press, N.Y., N.Y., 1969, pp. 238-9.

24. Morag, "Planned and Unplanned Development in Modern Hebrew", in Lingua 8, p. 249.

25. For a fuller discussion of this problem see Morag, op cit. p. 255.

26. "School principals and teachers were informed of this decision in 1907." Encyclopedia Judaica, Macmillian, p. 999.

27. Rabin, (1970), op cit., p. 308.

28. It is interesting to note that some dialects of colloquial Arabic manifest a similar divergence from Classical Arabic.

29. This imperfict-perfect dichotomy is the traditional analysis of CH. Also, as a point of information, the description given here of the "Waw-consecutive" construction is a simplified version.

30. See section 2.1.

31. "In 1904 the Vaad ha-Lashon (Language Council) was founded to settle matters of spelling and grammer and to create new words for new objects...in 1954 the Vaad ha-Lashon was given status as the official Academy of the Hebrew Language." This quote, from the Area Handbook for Israel (researched for the Department of the Army by Foreign Area Studies, the American University, U.S. Government Printing office, 1970, p.72.), has been mentioned to illustrate that the founding fathers of the State Of Israel did not leave the language problem to "work itself out," but created a mechanism to deal with these important problems (cf. the situation in the new state of Bengla Desh) almost fifty years before the actual foundation of the state.
In his article "Planned and Unplanned Developments in Modern Hebrew," in Linqua, no. 8, Morag gives the date for the founding of the Vaad ha-Lashon as 1890, and for the Hebrew Language Academy, as 1953. In addition he mentions another official organization, the Israel Defence Army's Committee for Military Terms, whose work is important on a more general scale because of the "grass-roots" nature of the Israeli army and the relative frequency of military terms in common speech.

32. Morag, in Lingua, no. 8, pp. 251-2. Items appearing in double parentheses (( )) have been added for further explanation of terms which are not common in linguistic literature.
Also, some notes on the transcription used are in order:
/ᶜ/ represents a voiced laryngeal (glottal) slit fricative
/'/ represents a glottal stop.
The other symbols used are in accordance with the transcription found in Trager's Phonetics: Glossary and Tables, Studies in Linguistics, Occasional Papers 62, Buffalo, N.Y., 1964.
The "phonemes" listed in the first column of the chart have been analyzed exclusively from a written corpus, through the various vocal traditions. Their relationship to the actual pronunciation of the Hebrew that was spoken during the classical period is little more than educated speculation.

33. Morag, ibid., pp.253-4.

34. Blanc, "On the Arabic Element in Israeli Speech," Lešonenu la-Am, 53.6-14, 54/55.27-32, 56.20-26.

35. Blanc, ibid., in 56. p.24.

36. Blanc, in Weinreich, The Field of Yiddish II, 1965, pp. 185-201.

37. Blanc, ibid., p. 186.

38. Blanc, ibid., p.201.

39. Blanc, "The Growth of Israeli Hebrew", Middle Eastern Affairs, No. 5, (1954), pp. 385-92.

40. Blanc, ibid., p. 389.

41. The quote is from Morag, 1955, quoting from Zikhrōnōth waʿadh hallāsōn (Memories of the Language Committee 4, 1914, section II, b, 3.) Incidentally, waʿadh hallāsōn is Morag's DH phenemicization of Vaad ha-lashon. In relation to the borrowings from Arabic mentioned above, these were in "full accordance with the principles of the Language Committee." Morag, ibid., p. 260.

42. Blanc, 1956, p. 189, citing the work of Altbauer, "From the Language of Israel's Fisherman," (in Hebrew), Lesonenu la-Am, 5.3/4, Jerusalem, 1954.

43. This distinction could prove interesting in a detailed study, since the style of English taught in the secondary schools is British-oriented. (See section 1.4.1.)

44. This group is also made up of generally young people who, through the medium of contact with American or European hippies have chosen to emulate this style of life, which casts them quite outside the mainstream of Israeli society. The proficiency in English exhibited by some members of this community is not at all commensurate with their self-admitted deficiencies in formal education.

45. Ferguson, "Diglossia", Word, 15.325-340.

46. Ferguson, "The Arabic Koiné" in Language, Vol. 35, No. 4, pp. 616-630.

47. Blanc, "The Arabic Dialect of the Negev Bedouins," published in the Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Vol. IV, No. 7, Jerusalem, 1970.

48. For an in-depth look at the Druze and their dialect see: Blanc, "Linguistic Inquiries Among the Druzes of Western Galilee and Mt. Carmel," in Studies in North Palestinian Arabic, Oriental Notes and Studies, Published by the Israeli Oriental Society, No. 4, Jerusalem, 1953.

49. For example, Rabin, Chaim, "L'argot des etudiants en hebreu moderne," in Comptes rendus de Groupe Linguistique d'Etudes Chamito-Semitiques, Vol. 10, 1964.

50. For example, the article Çivrit šel šabat, "High-Falootin' Hebrew" which appeared in the influential daily "Ha-Aretz" 2.23.72. This is quite different, to my mind, from the question of "standard Language."

51. Goffman, E., "The Neglected Situation," Gumperz and Hymes; The Ethnography of Communication; an edition of "The American Anthropologist", Vol. 66, No. 6, Part 2; Menasha, Wisconsin, 1964, pp. 133-136.

52. Wölck, "Proyecto BQC: Metodologica de una encuesta Socio-Linguistica el Bilinguismo Quechua-Castellano", presented at the 39th International Congress of Americanists, Lima, Aug. 2-9, 1970.

53. Fishman, "The Relationship Between Micro- and Macro Sociolinguistics in the Study of Who Speaks What Language to Whom and When;" in Gumperz, J. and Hymes, D., eds, DIRECTIONS IN SOCIOLINGUISTICS, N.Y. 1968

54. In Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. Vol. 2, No. 1. 1965, pp. 59.-65.

55. Fishman, J., "Language Attitude Studies," in Anthropological Linguistics, May 1970, pp. 137-157.

56. Ibid., p. 141.

57. Klausner, Samuel Z., "Phonetics, Personality and Status in Israel," Word, Vol. 11, No. 2, 1955, pp. 209-215.

58. Klausner, Ibid., p. 209.

59. Blanc, H., "A Note on Israeli 'Psycho-Phonetics,'" Word, Vol. 12, No. 1,.

60. Mathiot, op. cit., p. 5.

61. Mathiot, Ibic., p. 5.

62. Rabin, "The role of Language in Forging a Nation: the Case of Hebrew.", The Incorporated Linguist, Vol. 9,

63. Mansour, J. "The Position of the Subject Among the Complements in the Sentence-Type V-S with S.J. Agnon,"(in Hebrew), Bar-Ilan 4/5.403-14. 1964-65, Ramat Gan; "The Determination in the Syndetic Genitive with Proleptic Pronoun in S. J. Agnon's Works," (in Hebrew), Lasonenu. 30.113-35, 1965-66; "Linguistic Alterations in Successive versions of Agnon's Novel "'Tamol Šilšom'" Hebinukh (in Hebrew), 39.135-42.

64. The term "automized" is contrasted with "foregrounded" which refers to a usage "that is not culturally expected in a given situation and thus draws special attention to itself." See Garvin, A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure, and Style, Georgetown University Press, Washington D.C., 1964, introduction p. viii and essay 1 "The Functional Differentiation of the Standard Language" by Havranek, p. 9.

65. Samarin quoting UNESCO (1953, p. 46) in "Lingua Francas of the World" in Fishman, ed. Readings in the Sociology of Language, Mouton, The Hague, 1969, p. 661.

66. An interesting observation by Herman: "English is (in Israel)...the language of the largest group of tourists, and the importance of civility to the tourists is constantly stressed through the press and radio." From "Explorations in the Psychology of Language Choice," in Fishman, Readings in the Sociology of Language, Mouton, The Hague, 1968, p. 501.

67. Herman, Ibid.,

68. Kloss, "Types of Multilingual Communities: A Discussion of Ten Variables," International Journal of American Linguistics, Vol. 33, No. 4, October 1967.

69. Klausner, op. cit., p. 209.

70. Labov, The Social Stratification of English in New York City, Center for Applied Linguistics. 1965.

71. Friedrich, "The Linguistic Reflex of Social Change: From Tsarist to Soviet Russian Kinship," in Lieberson, ed., Explorations in Sociolinguistics, Indiana University, 1967, pp. 31-57.

72. Hymes, "Two Types of Linguistic Relativity", in Sociolinguistics, Bright, ed., Mouton, 1966, pp. 114-167.

BIBLIOGRAPHY*

1. Bentwich, Norman. Israel: Two Fateful Years. Elek Books Ltd. London. 1970. p. 115.

2. Blanc, Haim. "La-yesod ha-ʿarvi šeba-dibbur ha-yisraeli" ("On the Arabic Element in Israeli Speech".) Lesonenu La-am. Jerusalem. 53.6-14, 54/55. 27-32. 56.20-26.

_____ "Studies in North Palestinian Arabic: Linguistic Inquiries Among the Druzes of Western Galilee and Mt. Carmel." Oriental Notes and Studies, No. 4, The Israel Oriental Society. Jerusalem. 1953. p. 139.

_____ "The Growth of Israeli Hebrew." Middle Eastern Affairs. New York. No. 5. pp. 385-92. 1954.

_____ "Dialect Research in Israel." Orbis. Louvain. 1956. No. 5. pp. 185-90.

_____ "A Note on Israeli 'Psycho-Phonetics'." Word. New York. Vol. 12. pp. 106-113.

_____ "Some Yiddish Influences on Israeli Hebrew." in Weinreich, U. (ed.) The Field of Yiddish II Mouton, The Hague. 1965. pp. 185-201.

_____ "The Israeli Koiné as an Emergent National Standard." in Ferguson, C., Fishman, J. and das Gupta, G., eds. Language Problems of Developing Countries. Wiley, New York, N.Y. 1968. pp. 237-151.

_____ "The Arabic Dialect of the Negev Bedouins." The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Proceedings. Jerusalem. 1970. Vol. IV, No. 7, pp. 112-150.

3. Ferguson, Charles, "The Arabic Koiné." Language, 35. 616-630.

_____ "Diglossia." Word. 15.325-40.

_____ "Baby Talk in Six Languages." Gumperz, J. and Hymes, D., eds. The Ethnography of Communication. American Anthropologist, 66 (6). pp. 103-114.

_____ "National Sociolinguistic Profile Formulas." Bright, W., ed. Sociolinguistics. Mouton. The Hague. pp. 309-324.

_____ "The Role of Arabic in Ethiopia: A Sociolinguistic Perspective." Notes of the 21st Annual Georgetown Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics. Georgetown University Press. 1970. pp. 355-267.

*See addendum at end of bibliography.

4. Fishman, Joshua. "The Relationship Between Micro- and Macro-Sociolinguistics in the Study of Who Speaks What to Whom and When?" Gumperz, J. and Hymes, Ed., eds. Directions in Sociolinguistics. New York 1968.

_____ "Language Attitude Studies." Anthropological Linguistics. May, 1970. pp. 137-157.

5. Friedrich, Paul. "The Linguistic Reflex of Social Change: From Tsarist to Soviet Russian Kinship." Liberson, S., ed. Exploration in Sociolinguistics. Indiana University. 1967. pp. 31-57.

6. Garvin, Paul. A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure, and Style, Georgetown University Press, Washington, D. C., 1964.

7. Goffman, Erving. "The Neglected Situation." Gumperz and Hymes: The Ethnography of Communication; an edition of The American Anthropologist, Vol. 66, No. 6, Part 2, Menasha, Wisconsin, 1964, pp. 133-136.

8. Herman, Simon. "Exploration in the Sociol Psychology of Language Choice." Fishman, J., ed. Readings in the Sociology of Language. Mouton. The Hague. 1968. pp. 492-511.

9. Hymes, Del. "Two Types of Linguistic Relativity." in Bright W., ed. Sociolinguistics. Mouton, The Hague. 1966. pp. 114-167.

10. Israel Government Printing Office. Newspapers and Periodicals Appearing in Israel. 1966.

_____ Language, Literacy and Educational Attainment. Information from the 1960 Census. Vols. 15 (1963), 29, (1966), 30, (1966).

11. Klausner, Samuel. "Phonetics, Personality, and Status in Israel." Word. Vol. 11, No. 2, 1955. pp. 209-215.

12. Kloss, Heinz. Die Entstehung Neur Germanischer Kulturspachen, 1850-1950, Munich, Pohl. 1950.

_____ "Types of Multilingual Communities: A Discussion of Ten Variables." International Journal of American Linguistics. Vol. 33, No. 4, Oct. 1967.

13. Labov, William. The Social Stratification of English in New York City. Center of Applied Linguistics. Washington. 1966.

14. Lambert, Wallace, Anisfeld, Moshe, and Yeni-Komshian, Grace. "Evaluational Reactions of Jewish and Arab Adolescents to Dialect and Language Varieties." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. Vol. 2. No. 1, 1965. pp. 84-90.

15. Mansour, J. "The Position of the Subject Among the Complement in the Sentence-Type V-S with S. J. Agnon." Bar-Ilan, 4/5.403-14.

16. Mathiot, M., "The Current State of Sociolinguistics in the United States." in Man, Language and Society. ed. Ghosh, S., Mouton: The Hague, pp. 168-178.

17. Morag, Shlomo. "Planned and Unplanned Development in Modern Hebrew." Lingua 8. 1969. 247-263.

_____ "Uniformity and Diversity in a Language: Dialects and Forms of Speech in Modern Hebrew." Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Linguists. Geneva, 1969. pp. 639-644.

18. Rabin, Chiam. "L'argot des etudiants en hebreu moderne." Comptes rendus, Groupe Linguistique d'Etudes Chamito-Semitiques. Bordeaux. 1964. Vol. 10. pp. 60-63.

_____ "The Role of Language in Forging a Nation." The Incorporated Linguist. Vol. 9, No.1, Jan. 1970. pp. 7-11.

_____ "Hebrew." Sebaeck, T., ed. Current Trends in Linguistics. Vol. 6. Mouton, The Hague. 1970. pp. 304-346.

19. Samarin, William. "Response to: Social Dialects from a Linguistic Perspective." Socialinguistics: A Cross-Disciplinary Perspective. Center for Applied Linguistics. 1971. pp. 136-140.

20. Smith, Harvey and others. Area Handbook for Israel. U. S. Government Printing Office. Washington. 1970. p. 457.

21. Stewart, William. "A Sociolinguistic Typology for Describing National Bilingualism." Fishman, J. ed. Readings in the Sociology of Language. Mouton, The Hague. 1968. pp. 531-545.

22. Trager, George. "Phonetics: Glossary and Tables." 2nd. edit. revised. Studies in Linguistics. Buffalo. 1964. p. 26.

Addendum: Bachi, R. "A Statistical Analysis of the Revival of Hebrew in Israel." Scripta Hierosolymitana, III. 1955. pp. 279-247.